

REMARKS

Claims 1-30 are currently pending in the subject application and are presently under consideration. Claims 1, 4 and 16 have been amended as shown on pp. 2-3 and 8-9 of the Reply. The Examiner is thanked for courtesies extended during an interview conducted on March 18, 2008. The main focus of the interview was on deficiencies of the 102 rejection. While the presented matter generally related to all the claims, the crux was upon wording of the amendments to claims 1 and 16. This wording has been revised according to Examiner's suggestions. Examiner agreed that amended claims overcame Batten. The interview was conducted with Bhavani Rayaprolu (Reg. No. 56,583), Allan D. Shapiro, Examiner Fitzpatrick and Examiner Kumar.

Favorable reconsideration of the subject patent application is respectfully requested in view of the comments and amendments herein.

I. Objection of Claim 4

Claim 4 is objected to because of the following informalities: The preamble seems to be missing the word "method" after "The method of claim 3, wherein said". As it is written, it does not make sense. Claim 4 has been amended as specified. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this objection be withdrawn.

II. Rejection of Claims 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 13, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20 and 28 Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

Claims 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 13, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20 and 28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by USPN 5768478 (Batten). Withdrawal of this rejection is requested in view of the following comments. In particular, Batten does not disclose or suggest each and every aspect set forth in the subject claims and indeed teaches away from Applicant's claims.

Combining of summed weighted accuracy scores to reflect expected frequencies or likelihoods of demographic or other characteristics of a group of signals that is to be evaluated is central to Applicant's invention. Applicant claims adjusting of weights applied to individual accuracy scores calculated for recognition of particular features associated with individual signal sets within a group of signals sets in order to reflect demographics or other relevant variables,

calculating summed accuracy scores, and then combining the resulting summed accuracy scores subject to weights chosen to be appropriate for different test data. To illustrate with an example, weights will be assigned during a training process to features of handwriting that are more important in identifying writing of females than males. Different weights will be assigned to the same features when identifying writing of males. The weighted accuracy scores for these features will be summed to generate separate summed accuracy scores for males and females. A test sample thought to be 75% likely to be from a female would then combine these summed accuracy scores according to this additional weighting term. This last step is novel to Applicant's Invention. Independent claims have been modified to better highlight this novel aspect of Invention.

Batten focuses on artificial neurons. With artificial neurons, a training set of data is used to determine weights of inputs that when combined will give the observed output. The artificial neuron can then be challenged with test data, and determination can be made as to whether this data is similar to the training set. As such, although Batten does teach combining weighted values of inputs, weighting is used solely for purposes of training for a particular application. A different type of test data requires a new training process. From column 1, line 60 of Batten, "The parameters of a neural processing network and of the interconnection pattern of the network and *the weights of the neurons must be chosen for each particular application*. The term "training" is often used to describe the selection of the parameters. If a network interconnection pattern is fixed, then training is performed by determining the appropriate weight values." Batten teaches that training is only valid for a specific application and thus *does not teach or suggest and in fact teaches away from combining of summed weighted accuracy scores, with these sums further subjected to additional weighting factors chosen to suit the needs of diverse applications*.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn with respect to independent claims 1 and 16 and all claims that depend there from.

III. Rejection of Claims 6 and 21 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 6 and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over USPN 5768478 (Batten) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of USPN 5097141 (Thiessen). It is respectfully submitted that this rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. Batten and Thiessen, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest each and every limitation of applicants' claimed invention and, in fact, teach away from limitations of the claimed invention.

Claims 6 and 21 recite features similar to that discussed *supra* regarding independent claims 1 and 16. Thiessen does not make up for the deficiencies of Batten with respect to this claim. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

IV. Rejection of Claims 7, 8, 22 and 23 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 7, 8, 22 and 23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over USPN 5768478 (Batten) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of USPN 7136710 (Hoffberg). It is respectfully submitted that this rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. Batten and Hoffberg, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest each and every limitation of applicants' claimed invention and, in fact, teach away from limitations of the claimed invention.

Claims 7, 8, 22 and 23 recite features similar to that discussed *supra* regarding independent claims 1 and 16. Hoffberg does not make up for the deficiencies of Batten with respect to this claim. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

V. Rejection of Claims 9, 10, 24 and 25 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 9, 10, 24 and 25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over USPN 5768478 (Batten) as applied to claim 8 above, and further in view of USPN 7136710 (Hoffberg) and USPN 7184591 (Thiessen). It is respectfully submitted that this rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. Batten, Hoffberg and Thiessen, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest each and every limitation of applicants' claimed invention and, in fact, teach away from limitations of the claimed invention.

Claims 9, 10, 24 and 25 recite features similar to that discussed *supra* regarding independent claims 1 and 16. Neither Hoffberg nor Thiessen make up for the deficiencies of

Batten with respect to this claim. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

VI. Rejection of Claims 11, 12, 26 and 27 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 11, 12, 26 and 27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over USPN 5768478 (Batten) as applied to claim 8 above, and further in view of USPN 7136710 (Hoffberg), USPN 7184591 (Thiesson), and USPN 7167587 (Ii). It is respectfully submitted that this rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. Batten, Ii, Hoffberg and Thiessen, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest each and every limitation of applicants' claimed invention and, in fact, teach away from limitations of the claimed invention.

Claims 11, 12, 26 and 27 recite features similar to that discussed *supra* regarding independent claims 1 and 16. Hoffberg, Ii and Thiessen do not make up for the deficiencies of Batten with respect to this claim. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

VII. Rejection of Claims 14 and 29 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 14 and 29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over USPN 5768478 (Batten) as applied to claim 13 above, and further in view of USPN 5142666 (Yoshizawa). It is respectfully submitted that this rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. Batten and Yoshizawa, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest each and every limitation of applicants' claimed invention and, in fact, teach away from limitations of the claimed invention.

Claims 14 and 29 recite features similar to that discussed *supra* regarding independent claims 1 and 16. Yoshizawa does not make up for the deficiencies of Batten with respect to this claim.. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

VIII. Rejection of Claims 15 and 30 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 15 and 30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over USPN 5768478 (Batten) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of USPGPubN 20050049983 (Butler). It is respectfully submitted that this rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. Batten and Butler, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest each and every limitation of applicants' claimed invention and, in fact, teach away from limitations of the claimed invention.

Claims 15 and 30 recite features similar to that discussed *supra* regarding independent claims 1 and 16. Butler does not make up for the deficiencies of Batten with respect to this claim.. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

The present application is believed to be in condition for allowance in view of the above comments and amendments. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

In the event any fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063 [MSFTP2220US].

Should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP

/Himanshu S. Amin/

Himanshu S. Amin

Reg. No. 40,894

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP
24TH Floor, National City Center
1900 E. 9TH Street
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
Telephone (216) 696-8730
Facsimile (216) 696-8731